Amendments to the Specification

The Examiner has rejected the specification based on a missing colon, citing exemplarity locations such as between "testing" and "The" on page 26, line 1 of paragraph [0057]. Applicant has detected the following missing colons (":") in paragraph subheadings, and requests appropriate amendment to the specification to correct these errors, asserting that these changes are not for the purpose of patentability. These amendment requests are made in reference to Application Publication No. 2005/000802863 A1, and supersede any and all amendment requests made in the application thus far. Applicant asserts that this amendment contains no new matter. The Examiner also objected to the disclosure because the priority date stated in the specification is incorrect.

Applicant amends the following paragraphs which respectfully renders the Examiner's objections moot.

Please replace paragraph [0001] with the following amended paragraph:

[0001] This application claims priority from U.S. Provisional Application 60/483,639 filed Jul. 1, 2003[[2004]] entitled "ASSESSMENT OF FOOD PALATABILITY WITH A DISCRIMINATION LEARNING PROCEDURE" which is hereby incorporated herein by reference.

Please replace paragraph [0057] with the following amended paragraph:

[0057]First Phase: preference and association ~~testing~~ testing: The single object preference test is used to determine object preferences. Three different objects were presented to the canines for twelve trials, each associated with approximately one gram of a moist food. The positions of the objects were randomized among the three possible well positions ensuring all possible combinations occurred equally within the twelve trials and the number of responses to each object was recorded. The object chosen most often was considered to be the canine's preferred object. In all subsequent testing, the preferred object was associated with non-reward.

Please replace paragraph [0059] with the following amended paragraph:

[0059] Second Phase: discrimination-learning ~~procedure~~ procedure: During the discrimination-learning procedure, the canines were given 12 trials each daily session with an interval of 30 seconds separating each trial. Each trial began with the simultaneous presentation of the three objects to the canine. The location of each object was varied in a quasi-random manner to assure that all possible combinations of object placement occurred equally during a twelve trial test session (Fig 1). The preferred object, determined in the preference test, was never placed over food, and the remaining objects were always placed over the test food associated with them during the association days. A trial ended after the canine displaced one of the three objects and retrieved the food (unless they responded to the object associated with non-reward).

Please replace paragraph [0061] with the following amended paragraph:

[0061] Stabilization Phase: The[[The]] stabilization phase was intended to establish the strength and reliability of dietary preferences. Canines were tested for 20 days using a procedure

identical to that during the discrimination-learning procedure. The number of choices to each

object during this phase was used to establish food preference.

Please replace paragraph [0062] with the following amended paragraph:

[0062] Reversal Phase: This[[This]] test phase was instituted after completing the stabilization

phase. The purpose was to determine whether the preferences remained after the objects

associated with the two test foods were switched. In this phase, as in the previous phase, the

initially preferred object was never associated with any food. The objects associated with the test

foods, however, were switched, such that the object associated with the moist test food type in

the earlier phases was now associated with the dry test food and vice versa. This phase included

association days, a training phase and stability phase, as described above.

Please replace paragraph [0063] with the following amended paragraph:

[0063] Data Analysis: The[[The]] number of choices of the nonpreferred objects during the

stabilization phases was used to establish the food preference. A food-preference ratio,

calculated by dividing the number of choices to the object associated with the moist test food by

the sum of the choices of the object associated with the moist and dry test foods, was used to

describe the individual data. Using this measure, a score of 0.5 indicated no preference for either

food, while a score of 1.0 indicated a complete preference for the moist test food. Statistical

analyses were conducted using Statistica 6.0c with significance set to $P<0.05$. Individual choices

over the stabilization days were analyzed using a two-way repeated-measures ANOVA, with test

phase (2 factors) and object (3 factors) serving as within-subject variables. Posthoc analysis was

conducted using Tukey's LSD test if appropriate.

Please replace paragraph [0066] with the following amended paragraph:

[0066] Results: The[[The]] object associated with the moist food was chosen to a greater extent than the other objects, indicating a strong preference for the moist food.

Please replace paragraph [0067] with the following amended paragraph:

[0067] Materials and Methods Subjects: Two[[Two]] male and three female beagle dogs from our colony at the University of Toronto were used. Two dogs were between three and five years of age and the remaining dogs were between nine and twelve. All the dogs had been in the colony for at least one year and all had previous experience on a variety of tests of cognitive function. The subjects were housed individually in pens measuring approximately 1.07x1.22 m and were fed once daily after palatability testing. Water was available ad libitum. Dogs were maintained on a 12:12-hr light-dark cycle and were exercised daily while their pens were cleaned. All canines underwent regular clinical examinations and had no health problems throughout the duration of the study.

Please replace paragraph [0068] with the following amended paragraph:

[0068] Apparatus: A[[A]] wooden chamber based on the Wisconsin General Test Apparatus (previously described in Milgram et al., 1994) was used for palatability testing. Vertical stainless steel bars, covering the front of the box, provided access to the objects and test foods associated with them. Objects were presented on a sliding Plexiglas tray, which contained one medial and two lateral food wells. The test foods could be accessed by displacement of the appropriate object from above the food well. The dogs and the tester were separated by a wooden screen,

which had a hinged door at the bottom, to allow presentation of the sliding tray, and a one-way

mirror above, which permitted the tester to view the subject. An incandescent 60-watt light

attached to the front of the chamber served as the only source of lighting during testing.

Please replace paragraph [0069] with the following amended paragraph:

[0069] Food Comparisons: Two[[Two]] foods were compared in this study: Purina Agribrands

Canine Lab Chow #5006a, a dry food, which also served as the regular daily diet for all the

subjects, and Hill's Prescription Diet (P/D)b, a moist dog food, intended to be highly palatable.

Please replace paragraph [0071] with the following amended paragraph:

[0071] First Phase: preference and association testing: The[[The]] preference test was used to

determine object preferences. Three different objects were presented to the canines for twelve

trials, each associated with approximately one gram of Hill's P/D diet. The positions of the

objects were randomized among the three possible well positions ensuring all possible

combinations occurred equally within the twelve trials and the number of responses to each

object was recorded. The object chosen most often was considered to be the canine's preferred

object. In the subsequent discrimination phase, the preferred object was associated with no

reward.

Please replace paragraph [0075] with the following amended paragraph:

[0075] Stabilization Phase: The[[The]] stabilization phase was intended to establish the strength

and reliability of dietary preferences. Canines were tested for at least 10 days using a procedure

identical to that during the discrimination learning procedure. The number of choices to each

object during this phase was used to establish food preference.

Please replace paragraph [0076] with the following amended paragraph:

[0076] Reversal Phase: This[[This]] test phase was instituted after completing the stabilization

phase. The purpose was to determine whether the preferences remained after the object food

association contingencies were modified. In this phase, the initially preferred object was

associated with the nonpreferred food, the object associated with the preferred food was not

rewarded and the object associated with the nonpreferred food was associated with the preferred

food. This phase included association days, a training phase and stability phase, as described

above.

Please replace paragraph [0077] with the following amended paragraph:

[0077] Data Analysis: The[[The]] number of choices of the nonpreferred objects during the

stabilization phases was used to establish the food preference. Statistical analyses were

conducted using Statistica 6.0c with significance set to $P<0.05$. In order to analyze food

preference, individual one-way repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted with percentage of

choices to each food and non-reward serving as a within-subject variable for the original and

reversal learning. Post-hoc analysis was conducted using Tukey's LSD test if appropriate.

Please replace paragraph [0082] with the following amended paragraph:

[0082] Results: The[[The]] object associated with the chicken-based test food was chosen to a greater extent than the other objects, indicating a strong preference for this test food.

Please replace paragraph [0083] with the following amended paragraph:

[0083] Materials and Methods Subjects: Three[[Three]] male and three female beagle dogs from our colony at the University of Toronto were used. All dogs were less than seven years of age, had been in the colony for at least one year and had previous experience on a variety of tests of cognitive function. The subjects were housed individually in pens measuring approximately 1.07x1.22 m and were fed once daily after palatability testing. Water was available ad libitum. Dogs were maintained on a 12:12-hr light-dark cycle and were exercised daily while their pens were cleaned. All canines underwent regular clinical examinations and had no health problems throughout the duration of the study.

Please replace paragraph [0084] with the following amended paragraph:

[0084] Apparatus: A[[A]] wooden chamber based on the Wisconsin General Test Apparatus (previously described in Milgram et al., 1994) was used for palatability testing. Vertical stainless steel bars, covering the front of the box, provided access to the objects and test foods associated with them. Objects were presented on a sliding Plexiglas tray, which contained one medial and two lateral food wells. The test foods could be accessed by displacement of the appropriate object from above the food well. The dogs and the tester were separated by a wooden screen, which had a hinged door at the bottom, to allow presentation of the sliding tray, and a one-way mirror above, which permitted the tester to view the subject. An incandescent 60-watt light attached to the front of the chamber served as the only source of lighting during testing.

Please replace paragraph [0085] with the following amended paragraph:

[0085] Food Comparisons: Two[[Two]] foods were compared in this study: test foods 1 and 2

were both dry kibble, similar in appearance and texture, but were based on lamb and chicken as

a meat source, respectively.